

REMARKS

In regard to sections 1-4 of the office action, the claims have been amended above to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In regard to section 5 of the office action, the examiner is requested to reconsider his objection to the drawings. The features of claim 6 can be seen in Figs. 4 and 5. Figs. 4 and 5 show the two conductors overlapping and each leg contacting both conductors.

Claims 1-4 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glovatsky et al. (US 6,299,469). Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glovatsky et al. (US 6,299,469) in view of Bennett et al. (US 4,900,264). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glovatsky et al. (US 6,299,469) in view of Chishima et al. (US 5,820,404). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 1 claims that second housing half is adapted to be locked with the first housing half at a prelocking position, and that the second housing half is adapted to be moved on the first housing half to a final locking position. Glovatsky et al. does not disclose or suggest that plates 38, 40 can be locked relative to each other at a prelocking position and subsequently moved to a final locking position.

Glovatsky shows a final locking position, but not a prelocking position. Glovatsky has an hinged plate which shows

an opened; not a well determined position before the locking movement toward the final-locking position. The present invention has a latched, well defined pre-locking position. The features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

In regard to Bennett, from Fig. 11, smooth undulations of adapter parts 84, 88 do not make a person think of an efficient strain relief device. Further, it seems there is no mention of strain relief (i.e. to neutralize the pulling forces and/or vibration on the connected cables from outside the connector). Adapter parts 84, 88 are metallic parts, made for confining close together the two cables, impeding the sheared portion of the cables inside the connector to relax, thus, maintaining the electrical contact with the sheared side of the conductor (column 8- line 25 et seq.). It could be said it is a strain-maintaining device.

Claim 11 has been added above to claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain,

Appl. No.: 10/533,468
Reply to Office Action of: 12/26/2006

the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 5/16/07
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

5/16/2007 Clair F. Main
Date Name of Person Making Deposit